

f6b2newc kjc

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

New York, N.Y.

4 v.

14 Cr. 534(JSR)

5 HARVEY NEWKIRK,

6 Defendant.

7 -----x

8 June 12, 2015

9 4:15 p.m.

10 Before:

11 HON. JED S. RAKOFF,

12 District Judge

13  
14 APPEARANCES

15 PREET BHARARA

16 United States Attorney for the  
Southern District of New York

17 BY: ANDREW C. ADAMS

18 Assistant United States Attorney

19 LAW OFFICES OF PRIYA CHAUDHRY

Attorney for Defendant

20 BY: PRIYA CHAUDHRY

f6b2newc kjc

(Case called)

MR. ADAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Andrew Adams for the United States.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Priya Chaudhry for Mr. Newkirk, who is present and standing to my right.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

The only motion that was filed was a request for a bill of particulars, which the government opposes, and I'm not quite sure why it opposes all of the bill of particulars. The response of the government is, oh, we have given you tons of information, go fish. Why should the defense have to go fish? I'm sorry. Did you want to say something?

MR. ADAMS: Not to interrupt your Honor, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Let's start with the ones that I think are quite colorable.

Request number 3, "Please specify the date on which the government believes Mr. Newkirk joined the conspiracy."

What's the problem with providing that?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I think that the issue is just providing it in the form of a bill of particulars. It is alleged in the indictment on or about August 2013, so I would say around August 1 or thereabouts is what we would be --

THE COURT: So to the extent that this information was

f6b2newc kjc

1 already with the defense in one form or another, I don't  
2 understand why you didn't just say, okay, it is the second time  
3 we are telling you, in effect, but here is a one-sentence  
4 answer, and it would be a three-word answer, on or about blank  
5 blank blank.

6 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, just to clarify the position,  
7 rather than hemming ourselves in in the way a bill of  
8 particulars might --

9 THE COURT: That's what they are trying to do. That  
10 is, of course, the strategic advantage to them and the  
11 strategic disadvantage to the government. And as to some of  
12 these requests, I think that is more than adequate. But it is  
13 not adequate to things like when the defendant joined the  
14 conspiracy, because that is critical to objections that this  
15 court will have to rule on as to whether statements come in or  
16 not into evidence on hearsay grounds and on other grounds. So  
17 the defense counsel needs that, needs it in a reasonably  
18 binding way in order to prepare her defense. You can say it,  
19 just like you just said it, which is on or about, but that  
20 means the date that you then give will have a leeway, say, of a  
21 week or two in either direction, but not months in either  
22 direction. So number 3 is granted.

23 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor I would just also say, as we  
24 are going through this, just to sort of flesh out the record,  
25 one thing that is not really mentioned, other than in quoting

f6b2newc kjc

1 my response, Mr. Newkirk has received two different reverse  
2 proffers. This is not a case where we have been cagey in any  
3 way. I have sent document after document.

4 THE COURT: I am not suggesting you are being cagey.  
5 You identified the exact issue. The point of a bill of  
6 particulars in this kind of circumstance, when there has been  
7 discovery and now I know about the proffers as well, is to pin  
8 the government down. The government has a natural desire not  
9 to be pinned down. The defense has a natural desire to pin you  
10 in every way possible. But from a judge's standpoint, some  
11 pinnings are appropriate because they bear on rulings the court  
12 will have to make, and other pinnings are not. So that's  
13 really where we are at.

14 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, sir.

15 THE COURT: With respect to number 4, "Please identify  
16 all other conspirators and the dates on which they joined the  
17 conspiracy," that is also granted.

18 Those were the only ones that seemed to me to be  
19 necessary for the purposes I have just outlined, but if the  
20 defense wants to argue on behalf of the remaining particulars,  
21 I will hear it.

22 MS. CHAUDHRY: Thank you, your Honor.

23 The first two were actually sort of the same request,  
24 which is what is their theory of prosecution, what was the goal  
25 of the scheme. And I asked this not to harass Mr. Adams,

f6b2newc kjc

1 because I have asked him a few times, but I asked this because  
2 genuinely, having reviewed the indictment, going through the  
3 discovery, having had the benefit -- and thank you again -- of  
4 the reverse proffer, it is not clear what the government is  
5 alleging the actual goal of this conspiracy was.

6 THE COURT: Maybe it was my misunderstanding of your  
7 request. All the government needs to prove to prove mail fraud  
8 and wire fraud is that there was a scheme to obtain money or  
9 property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses,  
10 representations, or promises. So it sounded like you wanted  
11 something beyond that. The object of the scheme, of a mail  
12 fraud scheme, is to cheat someone else out of money. That's in  
13 the normal course. This is not a 1346, honest services case.

14 MS. CHAUDHRY: My question was permanently? That's  
15 the question. Are they saying he was trying to cheat people  
16 out of their money permanently?

17 THE COURT: What does that matter? If I make false  
18 representations to you so that you will give me some money now  
19 and I intend and maybe do pay it back a month later, I have  
20 committed all of the elements of mail and wire fraud assuming I  
21 used the mails or the interstate wires.

22 MS. CHAUDHRY: Right. The distinction here is the  
23 allegation, as I understand it, is that a group of people was  
24 brought together to try to buy *Maxim Magazine*. Those people  
25 gave money to try to buy *Maxim Magazine*, and the sale didn't

f6b2newc kjc

1 end up going through. So I think what I am trying to  
2 understand --

3 THE COURT: It doesn't matter whether the sale went  
4 through. The question is, did they give their money on the  
5 basis of misrepresentations or not?

6 MS. CHAUDHRY: Right. So my question is what is the  
7 misrepresentation?

8 THE COURT: Intent, etc.

9 MS. CHAUDHRY: I guess my question -- and you will  
10 tell me if you disagree -- is was the misrepresentation that we  
11 are trying to buy *Maxim Magazine* or something else?

12 THE COURT: We will get to representations in a  
13 minute. But, 1, the way you worded it was, Please specify the  
14 object of the magazine scheme. So 1 is denied, and 2 is also  
15 denied. 3 and 4 have been granted. I think you are referring  
16 to 6six, "Please identify all false statements allegedly made  
17 by Mr. Newkirk; and, for each statement, please specify the  
18 date of the statement, to whom the statement was made, and what  
19 was false about the statement."

20 I certainly understand why you would want that, but I  
21 think that is a level of evidentiary detail that is not  
22 normally appropriate for a bill of particulars.

23 Remind me, because I haven't gone back and read the  
24 indictment. What does the indictment say? Were the false  
25 representations?

f6b2newc kjc

1 MR. ADAMS: There are a number of false  
2 representations laid out in detail in the indictment. There  
3 are a number of e-mails specifically referenced in the  
4 indictment as well as in the proffers that we have.

5 THE COURT: I see why you would want number 6, but I  
6 don't need to know that to make rulings.

7 MS. CHAUDHRY: To me, the case looks different under  
8 two scenarios.

9 We will take scenario one, that the misrepresentation  
10 is we are actually trying to buy *Maxim Magazine*. So then the  
11 defense is putting on evidence and challenging their evidence,  
12 showing that they were actually trying to buy *Maxim Magazine*.

13 The second theory is, they were never trying to buy  
14 *Maxim Magazine* and the misrepresentation is something else,  
15 that the stocks are forthcoming or this will be collateralized  
16 by something else. And then that is a different defense. That  
17 is a different trial in a different case, each of which has a  
18 lot of -- the Venn diagrams --

19 THE COURT: Why can't the government try both of those  
20 cases? We think he misrepresented his ultimate intention, but  
21 we also think that, in any event, he made various  
22 misrepresentations along the way, so to speak.

23 MS. CHAUDHRY: If that's their theory, that would be  
24 extremely helpful. Then we know how to defend that. The  
25 discovery they have given us actually makes the indictment even

f6b2newc kjc

1 more confusing, because I can't really tell where they are  
2 going with it.

3 THE COURT: Let me take a look, which I really should  
4 have done before we convened, at the indictment and see what it  
5 says in that regard, because it is a fairly detailed indictment  
6 as these things go.

7 Here. This is paragraph 8, "The purpose of the  
8 magazine scheme was to induce the lenders into loaning millions  
9 of dollars to the media company in order to finance the media  
10 company's purchase of the magazine." So there, really, you have  
11 the answer to number 1, even though I ruled you weren't  
12 entitled to it on a bill of particulars, but there it is in the  
13 indictment.

14 "In lending money and engaging in negotiations  
15 regarding such loans, the lenders relied, at least in part, on  
16 material misrepresentations made by Newkirk including, among  
17 other things, that the executive who Newkirk claimed to  
18 represent as legal counsel was providing financing and  
19 collateral for the loans for the media company's purchase of  
20 the magazine. In truth and in fact, Newkirk and CC1 never  
21 obtained authorization from the executive to promise the  
22 executive's financial backing or the posting of the executive's  
23 personal assets as collateral of loans from the lenders." That  
24 was part of the overview. Then they go on to specify  
25 particular representations regarding victim 1, victim 2, victim



f6b2newc kjc

1 3, etc.

2 So at least there they are not opining one way or the  
3 other as to whether or not they intended to not purchase the  
4 magazine. So if it is not in the indictment, I am not sure  
5 that they have to commit one way or the other. What they have  
6 to show, according to the indictment, I will read it again,  
7 "The purpose of the magazine scheme was to induce the lenders  
8 into loaning millions of dollars to the media company in order  
9 to finance the media company's purchase of the magazine." And  
10 then they go on to say that those monies were obtained through  
11 false representations. I don't see anywhere on the face of the  
12 indictment -- but I will ask the government to correct me if I  
13 have missed it -- the allegation that they also never intended  
14 to purchase the magazine and represented falsely that they  
15 were.

16 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, you are correct. It is not  
17 specifically laid out as Ms. Chaudhry has said. The attempted  
18 purchase was stopped at a certain point before the culmination  
19 of the deal, so we don't really know what exactly was going to  
20 happen.

21 THE COURT: So now you have your answer.

22 Anything else you wanted to raise about this?

23 MS. CHAUDHRY: I'm sorry, on that particular, no.

24 THE COURT: The only other thing we need to do is set  
25 a trial date.

f6b2newc kjc

1 MS. CHAUDHRY: Actually, your Honor, you didn't rule  
2 on number 5.

3 THE COURT: Oh. Sorry. "Please specify when the  
4 government believes Mr. Newkirk knew that the executive, *i.e.*,  
5 Calvin Darden, Sr., was not actually providing collateral for  
6 the loan."

7 I didn't understand that, forgive me, even as a matter  
8 of English. The date on which someone knew that something  
9 wasn't happening? That is like saying -- I assume the  
10 government is taking the position that he never knew that there  
11 were real loans.

12 MR. ADAMS: I think, as I understood the request, it  
13 was a question of whether Mr. Newkirk knew that Calvin Darden,  
14 Sr., had been either fooled or that these loans -- collateral  
15 was being hidden from him; and, if so, when he found out. This  
16 is actually specifically alleged in the indictment.

17 THE COURT: Why don't you point me to that?

18 MR. ADAMS: "Mr. Newkirk is alleged to have had  
19 conversations" --

20 THE COURT: Where are you reading from?

21 MR. ADAMS: I'm sorry, I am at 21 and 22. This is  
22 page 9 of the indictment. You will see here.

23 THE COURT: Hold on a minute. I will just read it.

24 (Pause)

25 THE COURT: 21 says, in effect, that after Newkirk had

f6b2newc kjc

1 falsely assured the executive that he would not be a guarantor,  
2 Newkirk continued to represent that the executive would  
3 guarantee.

4 This has been helpful. So what the defense is saying  
5 is, so he might have made representations that were not false  
6 before the representation to the executive that is in the  
7 indictment, like you will be a guarantor or I understand you  
8 will be a guarantor, or anything like that, and then later on,  
9 no, you are not going to be a guarantor, and it is only at that  
10 point that the representations to the victims that, yes, he is  
11 a guarantor become false.

12 Is that the way the government intends to go on this?

13 MR. ADAMS: Not exactly, your Honor. These are  
14 allegations that make it clear, at least as of these dates,  
15 Mr. Newkirk very clearly is making false statements about the  
16 collateral not being --

17 THE COURT: You think you could push it back earlier.

18 MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir. There are also allegations in  
19 here that Mr. Newkirk was aware throughout the course of the --

20 THE COURT: I think that is classic evidentiary  
21 detail, and I see actually no reason why the defense is  
22 entitled, other than as strategic value, to have that specific  
23 date. The jury maybe presented with several different options  
24 there, all of which the government can argue, all of which the  
25 defense can oppose, and all of which would involve a wealth of

f6b2newc kjc

1 evidentiary detail that ought to be before them and not cabined  
2 by any bill of particular determination. Again, it doesn't  
3 relate to any rulings I am going to have to make, so that  
4 request is also denied.

5 Did you want to say something else?

6 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes. The reason I asked for that is  
7 the government's maybe second discovery letter, the letter that  
8 accompanied their discovery, had a statement saying, We are  
9 including false bank statements of Calvin Darden, Sr.'s, and we  
10 have a witness that will say that Mr. Newkirk did not know that  
11 these statements were false.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MS. CHAUDHRY: That was part of tying into when are  
14 they saying he joined the conspiracy, then, if --

15 THE COURT: Who is the witness? I will ask the  
16 government that. Mr. Prosecutor?

17 MR. ADAMS: Yes, your Honor, if I could just review, I  
18 brought the discovery letters. If I can just review that for  
19 one second.

20 MS. CHAUDHRY: I think it is the second one.

21 MR. ADAMS: Do you have a date?

22 MS. CHAUDHRY: May 4.

23 THE COURT: This is presumably a *Brady* disclosure,  
24 yes?

25 MR. ADAMS: One moment, your Honor, I think it is a

f6b2newc kjc

1 different letter.

2 THE COURT: I see. All right.

3 MS. CHAUDHRY: I'm sorry, it is the first one.

4 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, what we wrote in the discovery  
5 letter, for the record, is, "Please be aware that an individual  
6 who the government may call as a witness in this matter, who I  
7 will call witness 1, has previously informed the government in  
8 substance and in part that:

9 "1. Newkirk and witness 1 discussed the need to  
10 obtain the signature of Calvin Darden, Sr., for certain  
11 documents relating to the attempted purchase of *Maxim Magazine*  
12 and related assets and that witness 1 informed Newkirk that  
13 Calvin Darden, Sr., would never sign such documents; and

14 "2. Newkirk was not initially aware of the falsity or  
15 forgery of bank statements purporting to reflect that of Calvin  
16 Darden, Sr., at the time such documents were provide today a  
17 potential lender in the course of the attempted purchase of  
18 *Maxim Magazine* and the related assets."

19 THE COURT: So that was presumably a *Brady* disclosure.  
20 So who is the witness?

21 MR. ADAMS: Who is?

22 THE COURT: Who is the witness.

23 MR. ADAMS: Likely to the Calvin Darden, Jr., if we  
24 choose to call him.

25 THE COURT: So you have that now. That actually

f6b2newc kjc

1 wasn't what you were seeking to obtain through your formal  
2 motion, but you got it anyway.

3 So now I think we are ready to set a trial date, are  
4 we not?

5 MS. CHAUDHRY: I have another couple of issues to  
6 raise.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

8 MS. CHAUDHRY: Just, we see each other so rarely, I  
9 figured I would take as much time as we could.

10 So, your Honor, I am aware that yesterday was my date  
11 to submit all motions. An issue has come up, and I can tell  
12 you the issue first and then how it came up yesterday, just to  
13 trigger to the court that there may be additional things we  
14 need to do that we did not expect to do.

15 The issue is this: A huge part of this case is about  
16 Harvey Newkirk, as a lawyer, working at Bryan Cave, working on  
17 this *Maxim* deal, and the deal was a fraud. Both reading the  
18 indictment and the discovery and having had some conversations  
19 with Bryan Cave, a big part of the government's case is he was  
20 also defrauding Bryan Cave, and he knew from the outset that  
21 this was a fraud. He was lying to the law firm about who his  
22 client was, what was really going on, and I expect that  
23 there --

24 THE COURT: Who is the "he" in that sentence?

25 MS. CHAUDHRY: Mr. Newkirk.

f6b2newc kjc

1 THE COURT: Mr. Newkirk was lying.

2 MS. CHAUDHRY: That Mr. Newkirk was lying to his own  
3 law firm --

4 THE COURT: You are saying this is part of the  
5 government's theory.

6 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, it is part of their theory, and a  
7 big part of their case, that he was achieving this big fraud by  
8 being part of this big law firm, having partners and associates  
9 work with him, and the other --

10 THE COURT: What law firm was he working at?

11 MS. CHAUDHRY: Bryan Cave.

12 The evidence in this case will show that a lot of  
13 lawyers for Bryan Cave were working on this exact matter with  
14 Mr. Newkirk and part of our theory of defense is that there was  
15 nothing in it for Bryan Cave; it was all open and notorious;  
16 that Mr. Newkirk is another victim of Calvin Darden, Jr.'s.

17 We had approached Bryan Cave in April, right when  
18 Mr. Newkirk was indicted, about payment of legal fees, and we  
19 had been in discussion with them, and they sort of led us along  
20 until May, when they finally told us that they will not be  
21 paying fees. So then we were drafting a complaint, and so  
22 Mr. Newkirk was in our office, we had been in communication  
23 with Bryan Cave's lawyers, and the issues we are bringing up in  
24 that complaint is their duty to defend and their duty to keep  
25 defending Mr. Newkirk, and that's the first time we learned, in

f6b2newc kjc

1 connection with drafting our complaint against Bryan Cave, that  
2 Bryan Cave actually represented Mr. Newkirk when the government  
3 first came to investigate this case. They had a white collar  
4 litigation partner sit down and meet with Mr. Newkirk and go  
5 with him to meet with the agents. That partner stepped outside  
6 the room with Mr. Newkirk when he had questions, answered his  
7 questions, and we are aware that it is Bryan Cave's policy to  
8 usually self-represent itself in litigation and matters.

9 So Mr. Newkirk was never given any sort of *Upjohn*  
10 warnings that, We are representing the firm and not you. In  
11 fact, he was told, We will stand beside you. We are all in  
12 this together. He spoke with them, he met with them, and they  
13 have since thrown him under the bus.

14 We now believe, having learned this, that Bryan Cave  
15 may have turned over documents that are privileged, that  
16 contain information that Mr. Newkirk gave them, believing that  
17 they were his lawyers, and that they may have turned that over  
18 to the government. I don't know the extent --

19 THE COURT: Out of this scenario you just read, you  
20 might have a motion, but you are not sure yet.

21 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes. I can't describe every --

22 THE COURT: I can see that possibility. So we will  
23 give you an opportunity to bring such a motion if you wish. We  
24 will factor that into the schedule we are about to set.

25 MS. CHAUDHRY: One small thing to also factor in is, I



f6b2newc kjc

1 would like to ask the government for the entire file they got  
2 from Bryan Cave; and, if the government is going to refuse, I  
3 would like to ask them to refuse quickly, so I can put that in  
4 the motion.

5 THE COURT: Maybe the assistant can provide some help  
6 here to narrow this. Documents received from Bryan Cave by  
7 subpoena or voluntary?

8 MR. ADAMS: By subpoena originally. There have  
9 been -- they are still subject to the original subpoena, and I  
10 would consider essentially everything that they have given  
11 me --

12 THE COURT: Okay, so pursuant to a subpoena.

13 MR. ADAMS: Yes.

14 THE COURT: And they did not indicate any claim of  
15 privilege.

16 MR. ADAMS: To rewind to the original situation, it  
17 was not clear to Bryan Cave exactly who their client was as a  
18 result of this fraud. There were discussions of privilege and  
19 things were withheld on that basis.

20 THE COURT: The client that defense counsel is talking  
21 about is the defendant.

22 MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir.

23 THE COURT: So normally when there is a lawyer from a  
24 firm who is representing an individual, it is implicit and  
25 often explicit that first he is to determine there is no

f6b2newc kjc

1 conflict between the two; and, second, that he is representing  
2 both because, in any criminal investigation, the firm will have  
3 an involvement as well as any individual. So assuming he was  
4 representing both, then of course there could be no privilege  
5 objection, because if either party to a joint representation  
6 waives the privilege, the privilege is waived.

7           However, if the defendant reasonably believed that  
8 they were only representing him, then there might be the basis  
9 for some sort of motion, assuming there was any privileged  
10 material.

11           So I guess the question is what was the nature, to the  
12 extent that you can generally describe, of the documents  
13 received?

14           MR. ADAMS: Originally e-mails that I think there is  
15 no question there is no claim of privilege for a variety of  
16 reasons. They predate any sort of -- it is from the course of  
17 the deal itself. It is not in the context of any sort of  
18 internal investigation or investigation after the fact.

19           I have not been given any notes, any paper documents  
20 written down by partners or attorneys of Bryan Cave or partners  
21 for Bryan Cave that are -- that would be notes or memoranda of  
22 any internal investigation.

23           THE COURT: That's where I think most likely a  
24 privilege question might arise, if they had disclosed to you,  
25 We interviewed the defendant and he told us X.

f6b2newc kjc

1 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, if I could.

2 THE COURT: There might still be no privilege issue  
3 but, at least absent that, it is hard to see whether there  
4 would be a privilege issue at all.

5 MR. ADAMS: And just to give you the full picture, I  
6 have had discussions in the course of witness preparation with  
7 members of Bryan Cave who have described interviews of  
8 Mr. Newkirk that took place after he was essentially placed on  
9 leave or just before he was terminated with the firm. It is  
10 not my understanding that they were having those discussions  
11 with him in the context of him as a client.

12 THE COURT: At what point did they represent him, if  
13 at, all in this?

14 MR. ADAMS: I think never. I don't believe that they  
15 ever represented him.

16 THE COURT: Let me ask defense counsel, when do you  
17 think they represented him.

18 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, I believe when the  
19 investigation began from the government. The litigation  
20 department -- this is a corporate deal. The litigation  
21 department came in, started counseling all of the people  
22 involved in the deal, not just Mr. Newkirk, and that continued  
23 and he kept meeting with the firm even after he was --

24 THE COURT: Wait a minute. Now you are claiming  
25 something different. You are saying they gathered all the

f6b2newc kjc

1 people who were involved in the detail and they gave them some  
2 joint instructions or some joint questions or whatever.

3 MS. CHAUDHRY: I believe they spoke to everybody. I  
4 don't know if it was jointly, but I know that every person was  
5 spoken to by a litigator, and Mr. Newkirk was spoken to  
6 separately by Marybeth Buchanan, who is one of their white  
7 collar litigators.

8 THE COURT: That sounds like an internal investigation  
9 by the law firm.

10 MS. CHAUDHRY: Except she then prepped him for his  
11 meetings with the agents, and she advised him to meet --

12 THE COURT: Who is "she," by the way?

13 MS. CHAUDHRY: Marybeth Buchanan.

14 And then she advised him to meet with the government  
15 and went with him and stepped out with him and answered  
16 questions during the meeting.

17 MR. ADAMS: And I can tell you I have no notes from  
18 Ms. Buchanan or anyone at Bryan Cave relating to that.

19 THE COURT: And the agents have not told you verbally  
20 what occurred there?

21 MR. ADAMS: Well the agents interviewed Mr. Newkirk.  
22 I have their notes, and those have been provided to defense  
23 could you be.

24 MS. CHAUDHRY: Can I ask, I keep hearing that the  
25 government has no notes. Were they verbally, was the

f6b2newc kjc

1 government verbally informed? Often the government will meet  
2 with someone and say, Don't give me your notes, just read what  
3 they say or tell me what happened.

4 MR. ADAMS: And, in full candor, with respect to an  
5 interview that took place after he was placed on leave, yes. I  
6 don't have notes from it, but I have been given sort of a --

7 THE COURT: Let me just go back. An interview that  
8 occurred after he was placed on leave, an interview of the  
9 defendant by whom?

10 MR. ADAMS: By partners at Bryan Cave in the  
11 context -- it's my understanding that this was in the  
12 context --

13 THE COURT: And you said to the partners, Don't give  
14 me the notes, but tell me what was said.

15 MR. ADAMS: The partners consider -- I think they  
16 consider the piece of paperwork product privilege. They were  
17 not willing to read me what was on the piece of paper. I did  
18 get a proffer of what Mr. Newkirk said, as opposed to what  
19 their impressions as work product were. But it's not their  
20 position that it was attorney/client.

21 THE COURT: Are those statements being introduced?

22 MR. ADAMS: Potentially, your Honor. I got these  
23 statements on Wednesday. I have not provided them as of today.

24 THE COURT: So it sounds like we are down to those  
25 statements.

f6b2newc kjc

1 MR. ADAMS: I'm sorry, sir. Just the very last piece,  
2 so that we have got everything on the table. At some time well  
3 after the fact, I think even after Mr. Newkirk was formally  
4 terminated, although potentially just before that, but around  
5 July of 2014, an associate, in the context of responding to  
6 some sort of civil discovery demand served on Bryan Cave, and I  
7 think directly on Bryan Cave as either a party or a third  
8 party, again called Mr. Newkirk in order to get information  
9 relevant to this third-party subpoena, and Mr. Newkirk provided  
10 some information there. Again, that wasn't made at the request  
11 of law enforcement or to law enforcement.

12 THE COURT: That was at the point where he already had  
13 his own counsel?

14 MR. ADAMS: I don't believe so. Again, I think at  
15 that point for sure he was out of the firm as an employee is my  
16 understanding.

17 THE COURT: But that doesn't mean he might not have  
18 been under the reasonable impression he was still being  
19 represented by the firm.

20 So it sounds like there were a few statements in the  
21 second category that the government is about to turn over, I  
22 gather, yes, the ones you just got on Wednesday.

23 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, to be honest, I don't consider  
24 them Rule 16. I consider them 3500 material.

25 THE COURT: Turn them over.

f6b2newc kjc

1 MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir.

2 THE COURT: And then the last item was in a memo form.

3 MR. ADAMS: No. In witness preparation, Mr. Newkirk's  
4 statements were related to me.

5 THE COURT: By the associate.

6 MR. ADAMS: By the associate. I did not receive a  
7 piece of paper.

8 THE COURT: Are those statement you are planning to  
9 offer in evidence?

10 MR. ADAMS: One of those statements, yes.

11 THE COURT: So I think the statement that you are  
12 planning to offer in evidence, you need to provide that to the  
13 defense.

14 MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir.

15 THE COURT: Now we know the scope of possible  
16 suppression, if there is any basis for suppression, as well.

17 I will not accept a motion to suppress on this ground  
18 unless there is an affidavit from the defendant personally  
19 setting forth the bases on which he believed he was -- both the  
20 fact that he did believe he was being solely represented, not  
21 jointly represented, and the basis on which he so believed, and  
22 then you can make your legal argument as well in an  
23 accompanying memo of law. But, as you know, under Second  
24 Circuit law, a suppression motion requires the affidavit of the  
25 defendant.

f6b2newc kjc

1 Anything else we need it take up?

2 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor. I would also like to  
3 ask the government for all of its correspondence with Bryan  
4 Cave. I believe that is both relevant and something that we  
5 need now in order for us to both investigate and make motions,  
6 because it is unclear to me what was actually asked and also I  
7 have a sense from my litigation already with Bryan Cave that  
8 they are being pretty cooperative with the government via  
9 subpoena. They are not going to be cooperative with us.

10 THE COURT: I would call that standard practice.

11 MS. CHAUDHRY: They are going to claim privileges,  
12 they are going to be uncooperative, and we don't want to be in  
13 a position where we have a witness everybody expects at trial  
14 to testify who has made statements not to government agents but  
15 to an internal investigation that's been turned over.

16 THE COURT: I don't see how that -- I don't know if  
17 the correspondence is voluminous or short, but I think the  
18 relevant thing is that the government's position is that all of  
19 this was pursuant to a subpoena, so you should get a copy of  
20 the subpoena, but I don't see why the correspondence would be  
21 something you are entitled to.

22 MS. CHAUDHRY: I was just wondering what --

23 THE COURT: That also presumably would be government  
24 work product.

25 MS. CHAUDHRY: Letters the government sent to Bryan



f6b2newc kjc

1 Cave?

2 THE COURT: Yes, if they reflect the government's  
3 theories.

4 MS. CHAUDHRY: But they have already published it to a  
5 third party.

6 THE COURT: I'm sorry. For these purposes Bryan Cave  
7 is being treated as, in effect, an adjunct of the government.  
8 And indeed, that's basically what you are telling me they are.  
9 But, anyway, for now; we can revisit the correspondence if you  
10 have something more particularized to offer. I think for now  
11 just a copy of the subpoena is sufficient.

12 Assuming the government gets all that stuff to you by,  
13 say, Tuesday of next week, how long do you want to make any  
14 motion?

15 MS. CHAUDHRY: I don't have my calendar. What date is  
16 Tuesday of next week?

17 MR. ADAMS: I believe it is the 16th.

18 THE COURT: Tuesday of next week is June 16.

19 MS. CHAUDHRY: Two weeks after that would be great.

20 THE COURT: I'll bet it would, but how about ten days,  
21 June 26.

22 MS. CHAUDHRY: Okay.

23 THE COURT: And how long does the government want to  
24 respond? You have a choice: Ten days from the 26th would be  
25 July 6, but there is some obscure holiday somewhere in that

f6b2newc kjc

1 period, so you have the choice of July 8, July 7, July 6, July  
2 3, July 2, July 1. Which one would you like?

3 MR. ADAMS: If July 8 was on the menu, I'll take that.

4 THE COURT: I thought you might. So July 8. Do you  
5 want to put in reply papers or just have oral argument?

6 MS. CHAUDHRY: If we do, we won't need more than two  
7 days.

8 THE COURT: So reply papers by July 10. We can  
9 schedule oral arguments after the papers. If I think it is not  
10 necessary, we can always cancel it. Let's at least have it on  
11 the schedule. How are we fixed for July 16?

12 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor I am beginning a trial  
13 before Judge Garaufis in the Eastern District on July 13. It  
14 should not last more than two weeks. It should be maybe ten  
15 days.

16 THE COURT: I think I am going to dispense with oral  
17 argument then; or, I will put it this way, I am not going to  
18 set a date for it. If, after I look at the papers, I can  
19 decide it without oral argument, fine. If oral argument is  
20 necessary, then of course it will be after your trial, but I  
21 don't want to put it off and you shouldn't want me to put it  
22 off if it can be decided earlier.

23 Now let's talk about a trial date. So given all of  
24 this new development, my plan to try it next Monday has gone by  
25 the boards, but how long a trial is the government

f6b2newc kjc

1 contemplating?

2 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, we expect seven trial days or  
3 thereabouts.

4 THE COURT: Defense counsel agrees with that?

5 MS. CHAUDHRY: I would say seven to ten.

6 THE COURT: So we will put aside two weeks. That may  
7 be more than necessary, but we will put aside two weeks. How  
8 about August 3?

9 MR. ADAMS: Fine with the government.

10 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, my other trial will be  
11 ending right before then. Is it possible to do it later in  
12 August?

13 THE COURT: How about August 17?

14 MS. CHAUDHRY: That would be fine for me. Given  
15 your -- previously you said you wanted to try this case in  
16 August. Ms. Farber from my office has a conflict, so John  
17 Harris from my office will be trying it with me. He is  
18 scheduled to be out of the country August 24 to September 7.  
19 We are happy to start September 10, which is long enough to get  
20 from JFK back here.

21 THE COURT: Unfortunately I have commitments through  
22 most of September. How about August 31?

23 MS. CHAUDHRY: That's right in the middle of when he  
24 is not in the country.

25 THE COURT: Give me the dates again.

f6b2newc kjc

1 MS. CHAUDHRY: August 24 through September 7. I think  
2 Labor Day is in the middle of that, so those days weren't  
3 really --

4 THE COURT: What's the story on your present  
5 colleague?

6 MS. CHAUDHRY: Beth Farber has a murder trial in this  
7 courthouse that is scheduled to start in the beginning of  
8 August and take like three weeks that she is trying with Avi  
9 Moskowitz.

10 THE COURT: How many people in your firm?

11 MS. CHAUDHRY: Oh, total maybe 20 lawyers.

12 THE COURT: All of whom presumably are dying to try a  
13 case.

14 MS. CHAUDHRY: Actually all of whom are trying cases  
15 right now.

16 THE COURT: Right now is fine but we are talking  
17 about -- I have given you three possibilities in August and you  
18 have said no. I don't want to be harsh, but I have to be  
19 concerned. This is a criminal case. September 10 does not  
20 work for the court. I have trials basically throughout  
21 September. I have a one-month trial in a criminal case  
22 beginning October 5. So it is either going to be one of those  
23 dates in August or it is going to be October 26. And if we do  
24 it on October 26, we would sit on the 26th, 27th, 28th but only  
25 half day on the 29th, only a half day on the 30th, and if it

f6b2newc kjc

1 went into the next week, only a half day on the 4th. So that's  
2 not as ideal from many standpoints as August, but let me hear  
3 which one defense counsel prefers.

4 (Defense counsel and defendant confer)

5 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, I would prefer my  
6 co-counsel to be able to attend the whole thing, so even though  
7 it is not ideal, I would prefer October. And if your other  
8 trial goes away and you want us to come earlier, we will come  
9 earlier.

10 THE COURT: What's the government's view.

11 MR. ADAMS: I have no -- well, the October date is  
12 acceptable. I would just ask that if it is going to be set, so  
13 that I can work with witnesses who are attorneys and busy, that  
14 we not be in a situation where if we say October and then two  
15 weeks from now it turns out it is back in August.

16 THE COURT: I agree. I like firm, fixed, and final  
17 dates rather than moving targets. What I am concerned about is  
18 the speedy trial rule and not in the technical sense, because I  
19 think this qualifies for exclusion under the Speedy Trial Act  
20 because co-counsel for the defense are otherwise occupied and  
21 counsel for the defense as well between the various dates. But  
22 just the spirit of the speedy trial rule, it is unusual that I  
23 put a criminal case off this long. But if both sides want it,  
24 I saw that defense counsel consulted with her client before  
25 making her answer, correct?

f6b2newc kjc

1 MS. CHAUDHRY: I did.

2 THE COURT: And given all of those commitments from  
3 what is clearly going to be a very busy and undoubtedly rich  
4 law firm, we will convene the trial on October 26. Look at my  
5 individual rules, because there are a bunch of things you have  
6 to get me the week before.

7 How long before trial does the government want to turn  
8 over 3500 material?

9 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, given the nature of some of  
10 it, I am happy to do it earlier than we normally do, a week  
11 before trial, if that's acceptable.

12 THE COURT: Yes, that's what I was going to suggest as  
13 well, a week before trial.

14 So pursuant to Section 3161 of Title 18, I will  
15 exclude from calculations under the Speedy Trial Act all time  
16 between now and October 26, finding that, for the reasons  
17 previously mentioned, as well as the overriding principle that  
18 even lawyers are entitled to vacations, and for all the reasons  
19 apparent from this transcript, the best interests of justice in  
20 excluding such time substantially outweigh the interests of the  
21 public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

22 Anything else we need to take up?

23 MR. ADAMS: Nothing for the government.

24 MS. CHAUDHRY: One small issue regarding permission  
25 from the court for Mr. Newkirk to travel out of where he is

f6b2newc kjc

1 currently allowed to go. If I am permitted to send a letter to  
2 the court requesting, I am happy to do that.

3 THE COURT: Yes, but consult first with the  
4 government.

5 MS. CHAUDHRY: I will.

6 THE COURT: See if they are in disagreement or not.

7 MS. CHAUDHRY: I just wanted permission to send a  
8 letter to the court.

9 THE COURT: All right. Very good. Thanks so much.

10 MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

11 MS. CHAUDHRY: Thank you.

12 - - -  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25